

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,810	WIZIG, LEWIS HOWARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RACHEL L. PORTER	3626	

All Participants:

(1) RACHEL L. PORTER.

(2) Nathan Paulsen.

Date of Interview: 5 January 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103, 101

Claims discussed:

Claims 53, 70; 77,94; 101, 118

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Pending response to Amdt filed 9/26/08

(3) Walter Hanchuk, Reg 35, 179.

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Spoke to Mr. Paulsen, indicating that Examiner would delay action, to issue Examiner's amendment to overcome 101 issues if applicants wanted to incorporate claims indicated as allowable (70, 94, and 118) into independent claim. Mr. Hanchuk returned call to follow-up and could not contact applicants. No agreement could be reached.